

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
FORT SMITH DIVISION

KAREN S. DECKER for
JOHN C. DECKER , Deceased

PLAINTIFF

v.

CIVIL NO. 2:15-cv-2088-MEF

CAROLYN W. COLVIN¹, Commissioner
Social Security Administration

DEFENDANT

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Karen Decker (“Plaintiff”), as next of kin, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) seeking judicial review of a decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (Commissioner) denying John Decker’s application for supplemental security income (“SSI”). ECF No. 1. This matter is presently before the undersigned by consent of the parties. ECF No. 5.

The Commissioner filed an answer to Plaintiff’s action on July 10, 2015, asserting that the findings of the Commissioner were supported by substantial evidence and were conclusive. ECF No. 10. On August 28, 2015, having changed positions, the Commissioner filed a motion requesting that Plaintiff’s case be remanded pursuant to “sentence four” of section 405(g) in order to conduct further administrative proceedings. ECF Nos. 12.

The exclusive methods by which a district court may remand a social security case to the Commissioner are set forth in “sentence four” and “sentence six” of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). A remand pursuant to “sentence six” is limited to two situations: where the Commissioner requests a remand before answering the complaint, or where the court orders the Commissioner to consider new,

¹Carolyn W. Colvin became the Social Security Commissioner on February 14, 2013. Pursuant to Rule 25(d)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Carolyn W. Colvin has been substituted for Commissioner Michael J. Astrue as the defendant in this suit.

material evidence that was for good cause not presented before the agency. The Fourth sentence of the statute provides that “[t]he court shall have power to enter, upon the pleadings and transcript of the record, a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security, with or without remanding the cause for a rehearing.” 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); *Shalala v. Schaefer*, 509 U.S. 292, 296 (1993).

Here, we find remand is appropriate to allow the Defendants to conduct further administrative proceedings regarding this matter. Therefore, the Commissioner’s motion to remand is hereby **GRANTED** and the case remanded to the Commissioner for further administrative action pursuant to “sentence four” of section 405(g).

DATED this 17th day of September, 2015.

/s/ Mark E. Ford
HONORABLE MARK E. FORD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE